

Application No. 09/588,350
Amendment dated October 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 15, 2005

Docket No.: 20162-00557-US
Page 4 of 6

REMARKS

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

The Office Action and prior art relied upon have been carefully considered. In an effort to expedite the prosecution claims 27, and 31-33 have been cancelled. Independent claim 28 and dependent claims 29 and 30 remain in the application.

Claims 29 and 30 were indicated in the last Office Action as being allowable subject to being rewritten in independent form. However, by virtue of the present amendment to claim 28, all remaining claims (28-30) are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 29 was indicated in the Office Action as being objected to due to an informality. This has been corrected in the amended claim.

The present amendment to independent claim 28 clarifies the points of novelty of the invention as compared to the prior art applied in the rejection. Thus, claim 28 now sets forth the distinguishing features including:

- (1) Each account unit is assigned to each user;
- (2) All electronic tickets owned by a user are stored in a corresponding account unit assigned to him;
- (3) Whenever said user wants one of his owned electronic tickets to be consumed, a demand of consumption of said one ticket together with an account address which is assigned to his assigned account unit are transmitted to a ticket examiner unit which is assigned to consume said ticket;
- (4) The ticket examiner unit is caused to access the account unit corresponding to the account address by transmitting a certificate of inscription for the ticket examiner unit (See step (b) of the claim);

422620

Application No. 09/588,350
Amendment dated October 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 15, 2005

Docket No.: 20162-00557-US
Page 5 of 6

(5) The account unit verifies the certificate of inscription for the ticket examiner unit; (See step (c) of the claim);

(6) After successful verification, the account unit transmits the ticket and a certificate of consumption to the ticket examiner unit; (See step (d) of the claim); and

(7) The user is required to generate the signature to the certificate of consumption. (See steps (e) and (f)).

Claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Walker (US 6,240,396) and Anderson (US 6,209,095) in view of Dean (US 6,182,131).

It is applicant's position that the cited references fail to disclose the transmission of the certificate of inscription for the ticket examiner unit to the account unit, accordingly the newly added steps (b) and (c) have inventive features.

Further, the cited references also fail to disclose the generation of the user's signature on the certificate of consumption, accordingly steps (d) to (f) have also inventive features.

In view of the above, consideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In the event the Examiner believes an interview might serve to advance the prosecution of this application in any way, the undersigned attorney is available at the telephone number noted below.

Application No. 09/588,350
Amendment dated October 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action of July 15, 2005

Docket No.: 20162-00557-US
Page 6 of 6

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees, or credit any overpayment, associated with this communication, including any extension fees, to CBLH Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 20162-00557-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated:

10/14/05

Respectfully submitted,

By

Morris Liss

Registration No.: 24,510

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

1990 M Street, N.W., Suite 800

Washington, DC 20036-3425

(202) 331-7111

(202) 293-6229 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant

422620